

Panel/Name of reviewer:
Name of applicant:
Title of proposed project:

Application number:

Please also write comments (not only numerical ratings) to each of following sub-items.

Numerical evaluation of the sub-items and Item 1 (Research plan) and Item 2 (Competence of applicant and quality of research environment) and Item 3 (Overall assessment) is made with ratings ranging from 1 (weak) to 6 (outstanding).

1 = weak, 2 = unsatisfactory, 3 = good, 4 = very good, 5 = excellent, 6 = outstanding

1 Research plan

Rating (1–6):

1.1 Scientific quality and innovativeness of the research plan

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: Is the project scientifically significant? Is the project ambitious? Is the project breakthrough research containing risks and does it have potential for exceptionally significant outcomes? Is the project innovative? Can the project generate new knowledge, new methods, new technology or new practices to end-users? If the project is multi/inter/transdisciplinary, how?

1.2 Feasibility of the research plan

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: Are the research plan, objectives and hypotheses clearly presented and realistic? Does the applicant acknowledge potential scientific or methodological problem areas and how are alternative approaches being considered? Are the research methods and materials appropriate for the project? Are the project management, resources and the division of labour and the proposed schedule appropriate and well-planned?

1.3 Relevance of the project to the defined call

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding question: Does the proposed project match to the description of the call and the agreed research fields?

1.4 Ethical questions (to be answered, if relevant)

Guiding question: Are ethical issues involved and if so, how are they taken into account?

2 Competence of applicant and quality of research environment

Rating (1–6):

2.1 Competence and expertise of the applicants from both/ all countries

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: Are the merits and scientific expertise of the applicants appropriate and sufficient for the proposed project? What are the merits of the applicant to supervise doctoral/postdoctoral students (if relevant)

2.2 Research team and environment

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: How is the project integrated into the research environment? Does the research environment support this project, including appropriate research infrastructures, and offer a wide base for researcher training? Does the research team bring complementary expertise to the project (if applicable)?

2.3 Added value of the joint research project

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: Is the combination of the research teams from both/ all countries appropriate? Is there added value showing that the collaboration produces a better scientific result than would emerge from

Panel/Name of reviewer:
Name of applicant:
Title of proposed project:

Application number:

research carried out by the countries alone? What is the role and significance of other national/ international collaborations (if relevant)? What is the significance of the mobility plan?

2.4 National research consortium (if relevant)

Guiding question: If more than one researcher from a single country serve as applicants, they form a national research consortium. In these cases, what is the significance and added value of the consortium for the attainment of the research objectives and international collaboration?

3 Overall assessment	Final rating (1–6):
-----------------------------	----------------------------

3.1 Main strengths and weaknesses of the project. Additional comments and suggestions.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Comments:

Please note that the final rating should not be a mathematical average of the sub-ratings.